



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,716	09/26/2001	Joshua A. Norrid	AUS920010667US1	9290
45993	7590	02/18/2010		
IBM CORPORATION (RHF)			EXAMINER	
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ			KARMIS, STEFANOS	
P. O. BOX 23324			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123			3693	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/963,716

Filing Date: September 26, 2001

Appellant(s): NORRID, JOSHUA A.

Robert H. Frantz
Reg. No. 42,553
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 23 November 2009 appealing from the Office action
mailed 22 June 2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,477,503	MANKES	11-2002
6,873,957	CHEN ET AL	3-2005
2001/0016825	PUGLIESE ET AL	8-2001
2001/0049613	GRAMANN, III ET AL	12-2001

7,167,904

DAVARAJAN ET AL

1-2007

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankes U.S. Patent 6,477,503 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) U.S. Patent 6,873,957 in view of in further view of Pugliese, III et al. (hereinafter Pugliese) U.S. Publication 2001/0016825 in further view of Gramann, III et al. (hereinafter Gramann) U.S. Publication No. 2001/0049613.

Regarding independent claim 1, Mankes teaches a method for establishing a reservation directly into a hotel Property Management System (see EOS; Figure 7). Mankes teaches providing a primary web server interfaced through a direct pathway to a hotel Property Management System via terminal emulation, said direct pathway excluding a Global Distribution System or a Central Reservation System (column 6, lines 4-60; Examiner notes that Mankes teaches that the ARS interfaces with the EOS and that the ARS replicates inventory

from the EOS. Mankes does not use a CSR or GDS). Control of inventory is maintained by the EOS (Property Management System) (column 6, lines 61 thru column 7, line 10). Mankes teaches that different classes of users log on to the primary server using a password and can then make reservations through the ARS if it is determined that inventory is available (column 7, lines 47 thru column 8, line 2). Mankes further teaches that the classes of consumers are consumers with special rates and commissions (column 5, lines 26-33) such as resellers (wholesalers/agents), known/unknown consumers (direct consumer) (column 5, lines 26-57 and column 8, lines 14-23).

Mankes further teaches that special inventory conditions based on consumer class and that such information is directly displayed to the consumer (column 7, lines 22-46) and that the various users access the ARS using a website (column 3, lines 20-56, column 5, lines 34-40 and column 6, lines 4-11). Mankes fails to teach providing three or more clone reservation sites to a primary reservation management site, each clone reservation site having a user interface tailored based on the user and responsive to a booking party attempting to book a reservation on said primary reservation management system, redirecting said booking party to one of said clone reservation sites to match said booking party to a tailored user interface according to the user.

Chen teaches a method for replicating websites for establishing a reservation. Specifically, Chen teaches providing three or more clone reservation sites to a primary reservation management site, each clone reservation site having a user interface tailored based on the user (column 3, line 59-67 and column 4, line 18-40 and column 4, lines 56-62 and Figure 3) and responsive to a booking party attempting to book a reservation on said primary reservation management system, redirecting said booking party to one of said clone reservation

ties to match said booking party to a tailored user interface according to the user (column 3, line 59-67 and column 4, line 18-40 and column 4, lines 56-62 and Figure 3 and column 5, lines 5-12 and Figure 5). Chen teaches that the cloned sites include: availability of low fare ticket search; selection of database; desired security levels, availability of quick search and links to tables that include: travel policies for the specific user, discounts available, preferred hotels, car rentals and instant ticketing commissions (column 3, lines 5-67 and column 5, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes for providing specific class information directly to the user using a password on a primary site with the clone website teaches of Chen because it provides for each class to have a more detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation.

Mankes in view of Chen fails to teach that the commissions and special rates (discounts) are recorded in a revenue pool. Pugliese teaches an electronic ticketing and reservation method that stores the fee accorded to the travel agent (paragraph 0040). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Chen to include the teachings of Pugliese because it provides for tracking and recording the commissions or revenues for classes of users.

Mankes in view of Chen in further view of Pugliese fails to teach periodically synchronizing clone inventory databases of said clone reservation sites with an inventory database of said primary reservation management web server. Gramann teaches a synchronizing reservation database (Abstract). Scheduling reservations comprises

automatically and periodically synchronizing a primary database with a secondary database (paragraphs 0036-0040). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Chen in further view of Pugliese for teachings reservations using at least three clone sites and disseminating inventory information with the teachings of Gramann for periodically synchronizing reservation databases because it provides for inventory information to be made available to the different sites and they synchronizing helps to reduce conflicts and lost information between users of the system making reservations.

Claim 2, Chen teaches wherein said step of directing a booking party to a clone reservation system according to a booking party type comprises a redirecting from a primary Universal Resource Locator to a clone Universal Resource Locator (column 4, lines 40-55). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Chen for directing a booking party from a primary URL to a cloned URL because it provides for the classes of users to have a detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation.

Claims 3 and 4, Chen teaches that the user is a registered user (column 5, lines 5-12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include

the teachings of Chen for registering a user because it provides for the classes of users to have a detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation and can provide for remembering users without the need to re-enter substantial information.

Regarding claims 5, Chen teaches that the cloned sites include: availability of low fare ticket search; selection of database; desired security levels, availability of quick search and links to tables that include: travel policies for the specific user, discounts available, preferred hotels, car rentals and instant ticketing commissions (column 3, lines 5-67 and column 5, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Chen for directing a booking party from a primary URL to a cloned URL because it provides for the classes of users to have a detailed and tailored view that receives specialized information and replicated information that a class of consumers would want to consider when booking a reservation.

3. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankes U.S. Patent 6,477,503 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) U.S. Patent 6,873,957 in view of in further view of Pugliese, III et al. (hereinafter Pugliese) U.S. Publication 2001/0016825 in further view of Gramann, III et al. (hereinafter Gramann) U.S. Publication No. 2001/0049613 in further view of Devarajan et al. (hereinafter Devarajan) U.S. Patent 7,167,904.

Claims 19 and 20, Chen teaches wherein said redirecting of said booking party comprises a redirecting from a URL address to a clone URL address (column 4, lines 40-55). Mankes in view of Chen in view of Pugliese in further view of Gramann fails to teach that the redirection is done from a primary domain to a clone subdomain. Devarajan teaches redirecting based on domain and subdomain as well as web address (column 3, lines 10 thru column 4, line 40). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Mankes in view of Chen in view of Pugliese in view of Gramann to include the teachings of Devarajan because it provides for incorporating customer specific information when making a reservation.

(10) Response to Argument

The Examiner summarizes the various points raised by the Appellant and addresses them individually.

A. Rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mankes U.S. Patent 6,477,503 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) U.S. Patent 6,873,957 in view of in further view of Pugliese, III et al. (hereinafter Pugliese) U.S. Publication 2001/0016825 in further view of Gramann, III et al. (hereinafter Gramann) U.S. Publication No. 2001/0049613.

1. Regarding claims 1-5, Appellant argues that the cited prior art fails to teach *via said customer-type tailored user interface on said clone reservation system, collecting from said booking party a reservation data set including itinerary and preferences for a customer and establishing a reservation in said hotel Property Management System according to said reservation data set if a matching service or product available according to a hotel Property Management System inventory database, said reservation being associated with a customer profile.*

In Response: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant. As noted by Appellant, the reservation data set includes the guests itinerary and specific-preferences (Appeal Brief, page 6). Appellant notes examples include, view, location, smoking/non-smoking, etc. (Appeal Brief, page 6). Similarly, Mankes teaches a method for establishing a reservation directly into a hotel Property Management System (see EOS; Figure 7). Control of inventory is maintained by the EOS (Property Management System) (column 6, lines 61 thru column 7, line 10). Mankes teaches that different classes of users log on to the primary server using a password and can then make reservations through the ARS if it is determined that inventory is available (column 7, lines 47 thru column 8, line 2). Specifically, though, the user must still make an inventory request based on the displayed availability (column 7, lines 47-54). Therefore, the customer is providing an itinerary, not vice versa. The requested inventory information is then sent to the ASR (column 7, lines 55-61). Further, as noted in Mankes, the type of information used in inventory data includes: room type, layout, bed availability, smoking preferences, location, as well as specific customer data, including cancellation, check out, and minimum stay (column 7, lines 31-46). Therefore, this type of data is the data used as the customer's criteria

when the customer "makes a specific inventory request." (column 7, lines 47-54). This teaching of Mankes is analogous to the Appellant's specification and definition of a reservation data set.

Chen teaches a method for replicating websites for establishing a reservation.

Specifically, Chen teaches providing three or more clone reservation sites to a primary reservation management site, each clone reservation site having a user interface tailored based on the user (column 3, line 59-67 and column 4, line 18-40 and column 4, lines 56-62 and Figure 3) and responsive to a booking party attempting to book a reservation on said primary reservation management system, redirecting said booking party to one of said clone reservation sites to match said booking party to a tailored user interface according to the user (column 3, line 59-67 and column 4, line 18-40 and column 4, lines 56-62 and Figure 3 and column 5, lines 5-12 and Figure 5). Chen specifically teaches that users register and log on and then the user is sent to the Sub Site that the user is registered on (column 5, lines 5-12; the Examiner notes this registering is analogous to the user profile). Chen teaches that the cloned sites include: availability of low fare ticket search; selection of database; desired security levels, availability of quick search and links to tables that include: travel policies for the specific user, discounts available, preferred hotels, car rentals and instant ticketing commissions (column 3, lines 5-67 and column 5, lines 30-40).

Lastly, Gramann teaches a synchronizing reservation database and making inventory requests (Abstract). Scheduling reservations comprises automatically and periodically synchronizing a primary database with a secondary database (paragraphs 0036-0040). Specifically, Gramann teaches that a user makes a web-based reservation (paragraph 0050). The system then accesses a database and updates the request reservations, with the user preferences,

such as whether the user has a smoking preference (paragraphs 0049-0051 and Table 2).

Therefore, Gramann also teaches collecting from said booking party a reservation data set including itinerary and preferences for a customer.

For these reasons, Appellant's arguments regarding claims 1-5 are not persuasive.

B. Rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mankes U.S. Patent 6,477,503 in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen) U.S. Patent 6,873,957 in view of in further view of Pugliese, III et al. (hereinafter Pugliese) U.S. Publication 2001/0016825 in further view of Gramann, III et al. (hereinafter Gramann) U.S. Publication No. 2001/0049613 in further view of Devarajan et al. (hereinafter Devarajan) U.S. Patent 7,167,904.

3. Regarding claims 19 and 20, Appellant argues that the cited prior art fails to teach *redirecting from a primary domain to a clone subdomain*.

In Response: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant. First, Appellant argues that the prior art fails to teach “redirecting from a primary domain to a web address” as recited in claim 19. However, claim 19 actually claims “redirecting from a primary web address to a clone web address” and makes no mention of a domain. As noted in the rejection, Chen teaches wherein said redirecting of said booking party comprises a redirecting from a URL address to a clone URL address (column 4, lines 40-55). Therefore, the argument regarding claim 19, is not persuasive because the prior art does teach redirecting from a primary web address to a clone web address. Regarding claim 20, Examiner acknowledged that Mankes in

view of Chen in view of Pugliese in further view of Gramann fails to teach that the redirection is done from a primary domain to a clone subdomain. Devarajan teaches redirecting based on domain and subdomain as well as web address (column 3, lines 10 thru column 4, line 40). As noted Devarajan teaches the use of domain and subdomain. Further Appellant's argument notes that the domains are accessed through URLs which as noted in the rejection, Chen teaches wherein said redirecting of said booking party comprises a redirecting from a URL address to a clone URL address (column 4, lines 40-55).

For these reasons, Appellant's arguments regarding claims 19 and 20 are not persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,
/Stefanos Karmis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693

Conferees:

Alexander Kalinowski/A. K./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691

Vincent Milin /vm/
Appeals Practice Specialist